

have seemed anti-humanitarian to suggest something very much more drastic. But I refrained.

Dr. Baker then treats us to a full-throated and sentimental harangue on what eugenists should believe. There may be innumerable views about that, and Dr. Baker has no more authority than anyone else to be dogmatic. The only possible reason why he is so absurdly dogmatic is that he fondly imagines that his degenerate values are absolute values. Their taint is obvious when he asserts that the defect of the botched "is not in the smallest degree their own fault"! How tiresome parrots are! Every muddle-headed spinster flings this at me whenever I address an audience on eugenics. As if it mattered whose fault it was! Who can help being anything? Do we say to the sheep, "Ah, poor sheep, we shan't send you to the butcher because it's not your fault you're a sheep, we'll put you on the hearth-rug and treat you as a fox-terrier." Did we say to the young men of 1914, "Ah, poor boys, it's not your fault you're males eligible for the front line, to stand between us and the German fire. Therefore you shan't go! No, we shan't let you go!" According to Dr. Baker's very plausible code of values, we should spare people the consequences of being what they can't help. Truth to tell, we should forgive nobody for what they can't help, and as a matter of fact we rarely do. Only the modern and sentimental world, including the J. R. Bakers in its midst, makes an exception in favour of degenerates. Personally, I don't even forgive Dr. Baker his letter, although I feel sure that he can't help it!

ANTHONY M. LUDOVICI.

NOTE.—Beyond the necessary safeguards against libel, excessive length, etc., we exercise no control over the letters in our correspondence columns and accept no responsibility for the opinions expressed therein. On the contrary, we welcome and automatically print any letters relevant to eugenics.—ED.

Eugenics and Socialism

To the Editor, *Eugenics Review*

SIR,—It is my belief that Eugenics will do as much to facilitate human progress and lessen suffering as any other reformist movement. Moreover, the advancement of the science depends greatly, in fact almost solely, on the actions of the *Eugenics Society*.

That the *Society* is taking the wrong road is my criticism which will not, I hope, appear impertinent—it is sincerely intended. We must realize that the great majority of reformers (whether mistaken or not) are socialists, and it seems to me that they are being definitely antagonized by the policy of the *Society* and by some careless mis-statements. Fellows and Members must emphasize the fact that Eugenics

is as necessary in the Socialist, as in the Capitalist State, and show how Russia is actively pursuing a eugenic policy to-day.

Eugenics recognizes class differences, but the classes are of ability, not of wealth! The talented, aristocratic members of the *Society* seem to confuse these distinctions, and also would deny the slightest influence of environment just as some people refuse to consider hereditary causes. *Lack of capital does not denote lack of mental and physical qualities.* Unless we remember this fact unlimited opposition will be provoked, possibly dishonouring the Cause.

I agree with the strongest critics of the differential birth rate, but would point out that this may be remedied, not aggravated, by improving the conditions of the depressed. (This, of course, does not mean that contraception propaganda should be slackened.)

Again, what has the *Society* achieved? Apart from the publication of a really excellent *REVIEW* it has done little. During the past year all its attention was paid to the Sterilization Bill which unfortunately proved a failure. I suggest immediate and progressive action to include the following:

1. Questionnaires to be issued to municipal and parliamentary candidates.
2. Support for sterilization operations as advised by Mr. Havelock Ellis.
3. Increased propaganda through the mediums of the cinema, radio and Press.
4. A drive for increased membership.
5. Some scheme for introducing birth control to slum families.

F. J. ALLAUN.

10, Wilmslow Road, Didsbury,
Manchester.

Eugenics Negative and Positive

To the Editor, *Eugenics Review*

SIR,—Is it possible that rather too much is being said about the negative aspects of eugenics. Are the 1 per cent. mental defectives too much with us in our thoughts? My own actual experience is very narrow, but many years ago when I visited the homes of a number of M.D. boys a striking thing was that many of these cases were sporadic, the weak-minded child was unlike his more vigorous parents.

Even then—twenty years ago—there was an unproved suspicion that some of these "sporadic" cases might be abortive attempts at abortion, attempts at miscarriage that had miscarried, leaving the poor child indeed alive but addle-headed. To-day there is almost an increased risk that attempts to avoid the possibility of incompetent children—by way of abortion—may only increase their numbers.